

The *National Era* is published every Thursday, on Seventh street, opposite Old Hall.

Single copy \$2 Ten copies \$15

Three copies 5 Single copy six months 1

Five copies 10 Single copy twelve months 2

Daily National Era to the 1st September, \$5.

Payments in advance is uniformly required.

Rules of Advertising—Ten cents a line for the first insertion, and five cents a line for each subsequent one. Money to be forwarded by mail at our risk. Large amount may be remitted in drafts or certificates of deposit. Subscriptions are to be sent to *The National Era*, Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, are preferred. New England notes are at least discount that of the New York note, and the same in the Western notes.

All remittances to the *Era*, whether on behalf of the subscriber, or for publication, should be addressed to G. BAILEY, Washington, D. C.

THE NATIONAL ERA.

G. BAILEY, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR; JOHN G. WHITTIER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

VOL. VIII.

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1854.

NO. 373.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

REVIEWS.

A MEMOIR OF THE LIFE AND LABORS OF THE REV. ANDONIR JUDSON, D. D. By Francis Wayland, President of Brown University. 2 vols. Pp. 360, 12s. Boston: Phillips, Sampson, & Co. Sold by Taylor & Maury, Washington.

This important contribution to the history of missions has long been expected, and the performance has justified the delay. Dr. Judson's life is the story of the commandments of missions by the churches of America in foreign lands. It was the day-dawn of the widespread plans of Christian benefaction, which are the glory of our land, expressed not only in Bible Societies, Home Mission Societies, and Foreign Missions, but in every other society which has for its aim and end peace on earth and good will to man.

The incentive to this great work, in the mind of Dr. Judson and his associates, arises from reading the "Star in the East," by the Rev. Claudius Buchanan, whose conversion was one of the fruits of the pastoral labors of the Rev. John Newton, himself a singular expression of God's goodness and long-suffering compassion. The lesson he had in the heart of Judson soon began to heat and expand. "It wrought in me a desire which would trust a young man whose words were clothed in language of Spanish simplicity: 'Give us the means to go, and at the end of some twenty years you may hear of us again.' And, with reluctance, the Board of Missions, then recently created, gave Dr. Judson a letter to the well-known Rev. George Burder, of London, proposing to resign Dr. Judson and his friends to the patronage and direction of the London Society. This letter is dated January 3, 1811.

The English Missionary Society declined any joint mission with the American Board, and the Prudential Committee decided to recommend to Dr. Judson and his friend, Samuel Nott, Jr., not to place themselves under the direction of the London Missionary Society, but to wait the further intimations of Providence at home. These were soon manifested in the wishes of the churches that they should be sent forth at their cost and charge. And Dr. Judson sailed, with his friend Nott, on the 18th February, 1812, from Salem. Nott, Hall and Rice, sailed from Philadelphia on the same day. This, then, is the era of foreign missions of the American church.

They were all great men, and the last was Dr. Judson, who is destined to be known as the Apostle to the Burman Empire.

The history of this man is a romance, written in part by the beautiful and gifted woman who filled his fortunes with his life, and whose love and devotion is unequalled by any heroine delineated in the pages of fiction.

Dr. Judson was a remarkable man. He entered the Empire of Burmese, and unswayed by any earthly protection. He had to begin at the beginning of his work—the language was without a grammar, a lexicon, the charm of this volume—and everything else was a spriggle and a waif.

He had to learn the language of the child, to whom the falling snow, in early spring, the Crystal Palace, the Christmas tree, everything the world of nature, the world of art, and the little world of man, is a novelty, a mystery, and a wonder. He had to learn to bear that never weary, and to a heart that never aches. Among all the "hopes and miseries" of this year of absence there was nothing more than the joy of a new life, or new in the way of a sighted world, to all who had been marvellous, and the most pell-mell natures will feel the pulses of that warm, gladness, womanly heart, and the gladness of his joy, when he is in spirit with his God.

He had to learn to bear that other "shocks of intense pleasure" that made our author reel in her saddle "with the intoxication of eight" as she rode over the "wondrous Campagna" and the "golden plain" "expansive and infinite shades and inconceivable brightness" of the "sky of skies."

We like Grace amazingly for her downrightness; because having a heart, she shows it up in her eyes, and is not afraid to let it be known. We can have with her congeniality because they are natural and honest, and therefore need a response in all true natures. To see such a "pilgrim up the aisle" of the Crystal Palace, the Queen of the British Empire, in the full force of that play of speech known as the adjective; but it is always a natural emotion, even when wrought to its highest extent, and is not put on, but where it comes as a ministering angel to turn the thoughts more trustingly upward, and make the tried and purified spirit harken with a new heavenly lustre. Perhaps the author is a clergyman's wife, and her own home set for the portrait. If so, we envy its inmates, one and all—from the happy husband down to the infant servant girl.

In strong contrast is presented the life of a convert, when the glad gushings of the heart of youth are represented as fettered by unnatural restrictions. The author arranges those parents who, to gratify a selfish ambition, and gain political influence, send their daughters away from free and happy homes, where they have been tenderly reared by the hand of maternal love, and shut them up within gloomy walls, where they are to that never weary, and to a heart that never aches.

He has to learn the language of opinion, too, he has to bear the strength and feeling of a woman's heart. We would give more for one page of her instinctive repulsion at the Papal system, as an imposition upon the chaste innocence of the human race, for the sake of a few lines of the *Advent*, by opposition; for the latitudinarian Juries, in particular, lawyers presented themselves and sat on the jury, who intended no favor to Lord Stirling, the Crown lawyers watching the proceedings; and yet they unanimously concurred in the verdicts in his favor.

To deceive the public on the importance of these verdicts, (as the characters of those Juries is unknown out of Scotland,) the opponents of Lord Stirling will have reason to regret the step. He will find more activity in supporting right and denouncing wrong. As a general rule, the "Fet of the wicked is swift to evil," while the well-disposed rarely show either diligence, courage, or unanimity, in pursuing the persecuted. Here it is that the bold few trumpet upon, and, by their activity and united action, triumph over individuals; while the many, timid and careless, shun their shields, shun the vision of rights and justice, or try to give up their cause.

Lord Stirling, however, did not even approve this severe rebuke of the *Advent*.

Most heartily do we command the book to all lovers of genuine sentiment, of refined and poetic feeling, of genial, sprightly narrative, and of pure religious principle.

THE FAMOUS CASE OF LORD STIRLING.

We understand that the Press is beginning to take notice of the important case. One man, at least, has surely come to the rescue; and, we believe, have heard of one more deserving the sympathies of the People of this country, both on account of the baseness of the efforts to falsify law and facts, and because there are really interests at stake which might, and ought, to be made available for the purpose of retrieving the bungling diplomacy of 1818 in regard to the Fisheries.

Our readers may recollect that, in August of last year, some notice was drawn to the case by the announcement that a company was formed for the purpose of trying the question in the Law Courts, as to the right of Great Britain to the Fishery grounds. The ground of this pretension was, that Lord Stirling actually possessed in law, by judicial act, royal, seisin or lawful right over the whole. And this is perfectly true.

The Government of England, although it could not openly violate the sanctity of the law, nor deny the act of the sovereign made in conformity with that law, sought, while holding Lord Stirling quiet under pretence of compromising with him for his immeasurable rights, by underneath means, to undo what it had vainly sought to defeat in open court.

They accordingly resorted to an illegal action against Lord Stirling by means of a trenchant, which action ought to have been dismissed at the outset, having been in open violation of the law and practice of the British Courts. And this was recently declared to be illegal in the House of Lords. But the agitation in the Canadian, subsequent to the establishment of Lord Stirling's right in 1818, was such that the judge of Scotland, at the desire of the Government, tolerated this illegal action, and so far as we are aware, has not yet been established.

For the purpose of making as heavy and emphatic as possible of the stand the Germans affirmer himself.

There is something deeply interesting in facts like these. In these volumes we see one of the most learned and able men in India—nursery of great men—a man of refined manners and cultivated tastes, surrounded by a company of native Christians who had yet only begun to put off their habits of barbarism, penetrating the recesses of the forest and threading every accessible rivulet, for the sake of preaching to almost naked savages the Gospel of our salvation. Wherever he could find listeners, were they many or few, there he stopped to discourse on the substance of redeeming love. Whether from his position as a teacher, or by the right he always ready to respond to those wandering barbarians the love of God, in sending his Son for our redemption. In this work he was remarkably successful. Rarely did he go into the jungle, without, on his return, "bringing his chores with him."

And when, at length, he was constrained, by order of the Board of Missions, to devote himself to the work of translation, it cost him a pang; and the paper which recorded his resolution to forsake the jungle, and devote himself to a life of greatest self-indulgence was bedewed with his tears.

It may interest the readers of this notice to be told that the present results of the Burmese mission, from its commencement to 1852-'53, show 88 mission stations, 112 substations, 64 missionaries, 205 native missionaries, 182 churches, and 14,252 members baptized on the confession of their faith and of their baptism.

Dr. Judson possessed a remarkable faculty for calling into active service all the gifts of native Christians. He saw that a nation in need could be converted, and that the world of its own population, especially with the ministers of the gospel. Strangers may come to the truth of the gospel, may trust in it, and the language, and by the blessing of God, may establish churches. But it is from these churches themselves that the preachers must be taken, who are to carry the gospel to their brethren.

Dr. Judson was for twenty-one months a prisoner in the death prison, so called, and with all appropriate, he was afraid that the Crown of England began to be afraid of him.

But the *Review* of Boston, and for seven

months in iron, he was taken out to act as interpreter for the King at Ava, in making the treaty with Sir Archibald Campbell. His death was twice determined on; once by the Peacock, the leader of the armies, who himself fell suddenly into disgrace, and was excommunicated to think and write. It is a work to be studied and treasured up for future use.

A GUIDE TO ENGLISH COMPOSITION; OR, ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY SUBJECTS FOR STUDY AND ILLUSTRATION. By J. W. BREWER, LL. D., Professor of English and Modern History, and Master of the Royal Grammar School, Worcester. Boston: T. & J. Maynard. 1 vol. pp. 360, 12s. Boston: Phillips, Sampson, & Co. Sold by Taylor & Maury, Washington.

This important contribution to the history of missions has long been expected, and the performance has justified the delay. Dr. Judson's life is the story of the commandments of missions by the churches of America in foreign lands. It was the day-dawn of the widespread plans of Christian benefaction, which are the glory of our land, expressed not only in Bible Societies, Home Mission Societies, and Foreign Missions, but in every other society which has for its aim and end peace on earth and good will to man.

The incentive to this great work, in the mind of Dr. Judson and his associates, arises from reading the "Star in the East," by the Rev. Claudius Buchanan, whose conversion was one of the fruits of the pastoral labors of the Rev. John Newton, himself a singular expression of God's goodness and long-suffering compassion. The lesson he had in the heart of Judson soon began to heat and expand. "It wrought in me a desire which would trust a young man whose words were clothed in language of Spanish simplicity: 'Give us the means to go, and at the end of some twenty years you may hear of us again.' And, with reluctance, the Board of Missions, then recently created, gave Dr. Judson a letter to the well-known Rev. George Burder, of London, proposing to resign Dr. Judson and his friends to the patronage and direction of the London Society. This letter is dated January 3, 1811.

The English Missionary Society declined any joint mission with the American Board, and the Prudential Committee decided to recommend to Dr. Judson and his friend, Samuel Nott, Jr., not to place themselves under the direction of the London Missionary Society, but to wait the further intimations of Providence at home. These were soon manifested in the wishes of the churches that they should be sent forth at their cost and charge. And Dr. Judson sailed, with his friend Nott, on the 18th February, 1812, from Salem. Nott, Hall and Rice, sailed from Philadelphia on the same day. This, then, is the era of foreign missions of the American church.

They were all great men, and the last was Dr. Judson, who is destined to be known as the Apostle to the Burman Empire.

The history of this man is a romance, written in part by the beautiful and gifted woman who filled his fortunes with his life, and whose love and devotion is unequalled by any heroine delineated in the pages of fiction.

Dr. Judson was a remarkable man. He entered the Empire of Burmese, and unswayed by any earthly protection. He had to begin at the beginning of his work—the language was without a grammar, a lexicon, the charm of this volume—and everything else was a spriggle and a waif.

He had to learn the language of the child, to whom the falling snow, in early spring, the Crystal Palace, the Christmas tree, everything the world of nature, the world of art, and the little world of man, is a novelty, a mystery, and a wonder. He had to learn to bear that never weary, and to a heart that never aches. Among all the "hopes and miseries" of this year of absence there was nothing more than the joy of a new life, or new in the way of a sighted world, to all who had been marvellous, and the most pell-mell natures will feel the pulses of that warm, gladness, womanly heart, and the gladness of his joy, when he is in spirit with his God.

He had to learn to bear that other "shocks of intense pleasure" that made our author reel in her saddle "with the intoxication of eight" as she rode over the "wondrous Campagna" and the "golden plain" "expansive and infinite shades and inconceivable brightness" of the "sky of skies."

We like Grace amazingly for her downrightness; because having a heart, she shows it up in her eyes, and is not afraid to let it be known. We can have with her congeniality because they are natural and honest, and therefore need a response in all true natures. To see such a "pilgrim up the aisle" of the Crystal Palace, the Queen of the British Empire, in the full force of that play of speech known as the adjective; but it is always a natural emotion, even when wrought to its highest extent, and is not put on, but where it comes as a ministering angel to turn the thoughts more trustingly upward, and make the tried and purified spirit harken with a new heavenly lustre. Perhaps the author is a clergyman's wife, and her own home set for the portrait. If so, we envy its inmates, one and all—from the happy husband down to the infant servant girl.

The charm of this volume—and everything else was a spriggle and a waif.

He had to learn the language of opinion, too, he has to bear the strength and feeling of a woman's heart. We would give more for one page of her instinctive repulsion at the Papal system, as an imposition upon the chaste innocence of the human race, for the sake of a few lines of the *Advent*, by opposition; for the latitudinarian Juries, in particular, lawyers presented themselves and sat on the jury, who intended no favor to Lord Stirling, the Crown lawyers watching the proceedings; and yet they unanimously concurred in the verdicts in his favor.

To deceive the public on the importance of these verdicts, (as the characters of those Juries is unknown out of Scotland,) the opponents of Lord Stirling will have reason to regret the step. He will find more activity in supporting right and denouncing wrong. As a general rule, the "Fet of the wicked is swift to evil," while the well-disposed rarely show either diligence, courage, or unanimity, in pursuing the persecuted. Here it is that the bold few trumpet upon, and, by their activity and united action, triumph over individuals; while the many, timid and careless, shun their shields, shun the vision of rights and justice, or try to give up their cause.

Lord Stirling, however, did not even approve this severe rebuke of the *Advent*.

Most heartily do we command the book to all lovers of genuine sentiment, of refined and poetic feeling, of genial, sprightly narrative, and of pure religious principle.

THE FAMOUS CASE OF LORD STIRLING.

We understand that the Press is beginning to take notice of the important case. One man, at least, has surely come to the rescue; and, we believe, have heard of one more deserving the sympathies of the People of this country, both on account of the baseness of the efforts to falsify law and facts, and because there are really interests at stake which might, and ought, to be made available for the purpose of retrieving the bungling diplomacy of 1818 in regard to the Fisheries.

Our readers may recollect that, in August of last year, some notice was drawn to the case by the announcement that a company was formed for the purpose of trying the question in the Law Courts, as to the right of Great Britain to the Fishery grounds. The ground of this pretension was, that Lord Stirling actually possessed in law, by judicial act, royal, seisin or lawful right over the whole. And this is perfectly true.

The Government of England, although it

could not openly violate the sanctity of the

law, nor deny the act of the sovereign made in

conformity with that law, sought, while holding Lord Stirling quiet under pretence of

compromising with him for his immeasurable rights, by underneath means, to undo what it had vainly

sought to defeat in open court.

They accordingly resorted to an illegal

action against Lord Stirling by means of a

trenchant, which action ought to have been

dismissed at the outset, having been in

open violation of the law and practice of the

British Courts. And this was recently declared to be illegal in the House of Lords. But the agitation in the Canadian, subsequent to the establishment of Lord Stirling's right in 1818, was such that the judge of Scotland, at the desire of the Government, tolerated this illegal action, and so far as we are aware, has not yet been established.

For the purpose of making as heavy and

emphatic as possible of the stand the Germans affirmer himself.

There is something deeply interesting in

facts like these. In these volumes we see one of the most learned and able men in India—nursery of great men—a man of refined manners and cultivated tastes, surrounded by a company of native Christians who had yet only begun to put off their habits of barbarism, penetrating the recesses of the forest and threading every accessible rivulet, for the sake of

preaching to almost naked savages the Gospel of our salvation. Wherever he could find listeners, were they many or few, there he stopped to discourse on the substance of redeeming love. Whether from his position as a teacher, or by the right he always ready to respond to those wandering barbarians the love of God, in sending his Son for our redemption. In this work he was remarkably successful. Rarely did he go into the jungle, without, on his return, "bringing his chores with him."

And when, at length, he was constrained, by order of the Board of Missions, to devote himself to the work of translation, it cost him a pang; and the paper which recorded his resolution to forsake the jungle, and devote himself to a life of greatest self-indulgence was bedewed with his tears.

J. G. W.

The above appreciative notice we find in the *New York Independent*. It is, we presume, from the pen of Henry Ward Beecher. We understand that he has recently come to the rescue of the poor, and have heard of one more deserving the sympathies of the People of this country, both on account of the baseness of the efforts to falsify law and facts, and because there are really interests at stake which might, and ought, to be made available for the purpose of retrieving the bungling diplomacy of 1818 in regard to the Fisheries.

Our readers may recollect that, in August of last year, some notice was drawn to the case by the announcement that a company was formed for the purpose of trying the question in the Law Courts, as to the right of Great Britain to the Fishery grounds. The ground of this pretension was, that Lord Stirling actually possessed in law, by judicial act, royal, seisin or lawful right over the whole. And this is perfectly true.

The Government of England, although it

could not openly violate the sanctity of the

law, nor deny the act of the sovereign made in

conformity with that law, sought, while holding Lord Stirling quiet under pretence of

compromising with him for his immeasurable rights, by underneath means, to undo what it had vainly

sought to defeat in open court.

They accordingly resorted to an illegal

action against Lord Stirling by means of a

trenchant, which action ought to have been

dismissed at the outset, having been in

open violation of the law and practice of the

British Courts. And this was recently declared to be illegal in the House of Lords. But the agitation in the Canadian, subsequent to the establishment of Lord Stirling's right in 1818, was such that the judge of Scotland, at the desire of the Government, tolerated this illegal action, and so far as we are aware, has not yet been established.

For the purpose of making as heavy and

emphatic as possible of the stand the Germans affirmer himself.

There is something deeply interesting in

facts like these. In these volumes we see one of the most learned and able men in India—nursery of great men—a man of refined manners and cultivated tastes, surrounded by a company of native Christians who had yet only begun to put off their habits of barbarism, penetrating the recesses of the forest and threading every accessible rivulet, for the sake of

preaching to almost naked savages the Gospel of our salvation. Wherever he could find listeners, were they many or few, there he stopped to discourse on the substance of redeeming love. Whether from his position as a teacher, or by the right he always ready to respond to those wandering barbarians the love of God, in sending his Son for our redemption. In this work he was remarkably successful. Rarely did he go into the jungle, without, on his return, "bringing his chores with him."

And when, at length, he was constrained, by order of the Board of Missions, to devote himself to the work of translation, it cost him a pang; and the paper which recorded his resolution to forsake the jungle, and devote himself to a life of greatest self-indulgence was bedewed with his tears.

J. G. W.

The above appreciative notice we find in the *New York Independent*. It is, we presume, from the pen of Henry Ward Beecher. We understand that he has recently come to the rescue of the poor, and have heard of one more deserving the sympathies of the People of this country, both on account of the baseness of the efforts to falsify law and facts, and because there are really interests at stake which might, and ought, to be made available for the purpose of retrieving the bungling diplomacy of 1818 in regard to the Fisheries.

Our readers may recollect that, in August of last year, some notice was drawn to the case by the announcement that a company was formed for the purpose of trying the question in the Law Courts, as to the right of Great Britain to the Fishery grounds. The ground of this pretension was, that Lord Stirling actually possessed in law, by judicial act, royal, seisin or lawful right over the whole. And this is perfectly true.

The Government of England, although it

could not openly violate the sanctity of the

law, nor deny the act of the sovereign made in

conformity with that law, sought, while holding Lord Stirling quiet under pretence of

compromising with him for his immeasurable rights, by underneath means, to undo what it had vainly

sought to defeat in open court.

They accordingly resorted to an illegal

action against Lord Stirling by means of a

trenchant, which action ought to have been

dismissed at the outset, having been in

open violation of the law and practice of the

British Courts. And this was recently declared to be illegal in the House of Lords. But the agitation in the Canadian, subsequent to the establishment of Lord Stirling's right in 1818, was such that the judge of Scotland, at the desire of the Government, tolerated this illegal action, and so far as we are aware, has not yet been established.

For the purpose of making as heavy and

emphatic as possible of the stand the Germans affirmer himself.

There is something deeply interesting in

facts like these. In these volumes we see one of the most learned and able men in India—nursery of great men

from bondage, on passing out of State jurisdiction into Federal, but shall be continued there, in virtue of said Federal Jurisdiction."

This is putting the case in a light which the masses can understand. They know that no such law exists—that no such law could be enacted—that there is no provision in the Constitution which could be tortured into a warrant for such a law.

The truth is, the coastwise slave trade is illegal and piratical. Every slave shipped at a Southern port, the moment it passes out on the ocean beyond State jurisdiction, is free; the American flag that covers him then leaves a friendless man, who conveys him to another port, to be sold, is guilty of transporting a free man to slavery, and he who buys him buys a free man.

We pass from this incidental point, to the second consideration urged by the *Sentinel*, against the position under discussion:

"Again, in the national Territories, over which the General Government exercises exclusive jurisdiction, slavery has always existed among the Indian tribes, as is proved by the fact that, under the jurisdiction of the United States, the Indian Government had no right to interfere with Indian law to 'secure freedom to every one outside State limits,' interfering with the law of the Indians, entitled in respect as other municipal law, and of course admitting, reorganizing, and protecting slavery. Thus the 'policy of the fathers of the Republic' gave countenance to slavery co-extensively with Indian law."

"We shall not undertake to contest the assertion as to the existence of slavery among the Indians, from the time of the organization of the Government. To what extent it is true, and with what limitations it should be received, we presume the *Sentinel* knows no more than we do, and that, we must confess, is very little. The answer to it, on consideration as an argument against the position of the address, is obvious and conclusive. Slavery has existed among the Indians, either as incorporated with the Government of a State, with the citizens thereof, or as distinct, independent communities; in neither case, there, within the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government."

THE STATE OF THE QUESTION.

The chances of the passage of the Nebraska Bill in its present shape become more and more doubtful.

The speech of Gen. Houston against it, in which he stood up manfully for the Missouri Compromise, condemned without qualification the attempt to repeat it, and, committed himself decidedly against every movement hostile to it, has inspired the advocates of good faith. Representing the extreme Southern State, how honorably his position contrasted with that of the New Hampshire politician, who occupies the White House. We have often said that if we are obliged to choose for the Presidency between an honorable, high-minded Southern man, and a Northern man, dominated by slavery, by all odds, give the former.

In the Senate, yesterday, the question being taken on the amendment proposed by Mr. Douglass, to strike out from the 14th section of the bill the following words—

"*The Senator Douglass—Slavery Sovereignty—* The *Senton Post*, in commenting upon this gentleman's recent speech, takes much pleasure in pointing out, as it asserts, his favorite doctrine of Senator Douglass, and that is, 'THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORIES TO RESOLVE TO EXCLUDE SLAVERY, fully maintained and vindicated.'

This is a work of great power, but the paragraphs italicized we have over read. The pictures of social life skilfully drawn, and with a truth and vividness that stings the soul. Who can read 'Mr. Ben. Doug.' and ever again put the maddening wine-cup to his lips?

There is, as the author has intimated, another slavery besides that of the negro race—a slavery that is felt in high places, and carries in its train madness and ruin. The slavery of the negro is the slavery of the body—the slavery of the *incurable* is the slavery of body and soul!

The volume is deserving of high commendation, and we hope it may be extensively read.

A clause was inserted in the Constitution stipulating that a person held to service or labor in one State, escaping into another, should be delivered up to his master, should be delivered up to his master. So, too, by its very terms a clause of compact, containing and implying a grant of power to Congress to provide for its execution, but to be fulfilled by the States, we hold, that its intent and effect were, not to impose any duty of intervention on the part of the Federal Government. But, Congress assumed power, in 1793, over the subject, and in 1850 again assumed power, passing another law to carry into effect this provision, and in 1850 again assumed power, passing another law far more stringent and arbitrary, for the same purpose. Was not this, intervention by the Federal Government with slavery? And who are responsible for it, than these same noisy advocates of Non-Intervention?

And invert in like terms the following:

"Which being inconsistent with the principle of no-intervention, it comes with slavery in the States and Territories, as called by the 'Compromise Measures,' is hereby declared incomplete and void; it being the true intent and meaning of this not to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, but to allow it to exist where it now exists."

The section is rendered the following—

"*It is inconsistent with the words, 'inconsistent with,' for 'superseded by.'* The section now declares this untruth that the Compromise of 1820 which was confined to the Territory of Louisiana, 'is inconsistent with the principle of the legislation of 1850,' which was confined to the territories acquired from Mexico. The Senate might just as truthfully declare that the Ordinance of 1787, for the government of the Northwest Territory, was 'inconsistent with' the act of 1812, for the formation of a Territorial Government in Missouri. Then, a right was asserted, in one case, which was not asserted or exercised in the other; and in 1820, a right was asserted, which was waived in 1850. But, because Congress in one act may assert a right, which, for reasons satisfactory to itself, it waives in another act, it does not follow that the acts are inconsistent with each other."

Was this Non-Intervention? Was the law constitutional, democratic, safe, benevolent?

Congress, in 1807, enacted a law regulating the traffic in slaves.

Was this Non-Intervention?

The Federal Executive, while the Spanish colonies on the continent revolted, and their armies were a descent upon Cuba, which they had a perfect right to seize and revolutionize, if they could, admitted them sternly that the Government of the United States could not tolerate any such act, as it would inevitably involve the emancipation of the slaves in Cuba, and thereby endanger the stability of the slave system in the South.

Slaveholders and their Northern allies, the pretended advocates of Non-Intervention, have always professed that a gross act of intervention, just as they have approved of the more recent threats of the Administration, through its 'organ' in Washington, to interfere for the suppression of slavery in Cuba, against the efforts of Great Britain and France in favor of its abolition. Will they not yet "organ," with its brazen throat spreading forth for Non-Intervention, had the hardihood a few weeks ago to threaten Spain with the intervention of the Federal Government, *et cetera*, to preserve the slavery of the African race in Cuba?

The records of our Diplomacy show that formerly repeated attempts were made by the Government of the United States to negotiate a treaty with Great Britain for the reclamation of fugitive slaves from the South, finding a refuge in Canada; and that a few years ago formal demands were made upon the British Government, and urged with great pertinacity, for compensation for slaves in American vessels driven by stress of weather into British ports.

The truth is, historically, Non-Intervention is a lie. It has never been the policy of the General Government, it is not now its policy. The advocates of it do not believe it, dare not trust it, dare not follow it to its legitimate consequences. What will they vote for the repeal of the law re-enacting the slave code in the District of Columbia, for the repeal of the law legalizing the co-astive slave trade for the years 1778 and 1800, the subject of a recent amendment by Mr. Chase to the same section?

"Under which the people of the Territories, through their appropriate representatives, may, if they see fit, prohibit slavery therein."

Whereupon a protracted disension arose, which was terminated by an adjournment. We shall see how many of these advocates of 'self-government' will vote that the People of a Territory have a right to exclude slavery. The Bill itself, in proposing a form of Government for the Territory, providing for the distribution of its various powers, and the appointment of executive officers by the President, gives the title to their profession. To consider such a thing an abomination, and introduce a simple resolution, recognizing the right of the People in the Territory to organize their own Government, derides its powers, and abhors all their own citizens.

The prospect now is, that the discussion on the Bill will be protracted in the Senate, far beyond the intention of its authors. Its opponents are prepared for a vigorous resistance, and its friends will be compelled to define position and guard against 'the fire in the rear.'

In the House, the debate has been opened, although the particular subject under consideration was the Homestead Bill. Mr. Mace, a Democratic member from Indiana, led off in a strong speech against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and was followed by Mr.

Skelton, a Democratic member from New Jersey, on the same side, both are what are called Old Line Democrats.

Mr. Macsham, a Whig member from Vermont, speaking against the same measure, Mr. Richardson, of Illinois, a supporter of the Douglas Bill, undergird to gag him. The Chair stated that the usage had been to allow members of Committee of the Whole on the subject of the Union to speak upon topics not immediately connected with that under consideration, but the rules of the House were against the usage, and must decide in accordance with the Committee's resolution. Mr. Macsham, allowing Mr. Macsham to proceed, shows that discussion on the Nebraska Question can not be prevented. The spirited speech of Mr. Fenton, (*a Sofy* from New York) in the House yesterday, is another favorable indication. He denied the right of Ex-Governor Smith, of Virginia, to preside for the Democrats, and told him, that if the Nebraska Bill was to be that test, he would find 'Sofys' springing up all over the North.

But, let one be deceived. Were the vote to be taken to-day, we should dread the result. The free States have 144 members of the present House, the slave States, 85—majority of the former, 59. The Representatives of the slave States will probably be united in support of Repeal, and all they have to do is to secure thirty votes from the North and West. These are more calculated upon the advocates of Repeal. An Administration, wading the power of slavery, and backed by such men as Cass and Douglass, that could not command thirty Northern and Western votes for a measure, designed now to be its leading measure, would be set down as very impudent or unreliable.

Let the People therefore be admonished that there is danger, imminent danger, such only as they are prompt and stern demonstrations all over the North and West can dissipate.

THE POLICY OF NON-INTERVENTION IN RELATION TO SLAVERY.

The advocates of the policy of Non-Intervention in relation to the Federal Government in relation to slavery, say that it is the only constitutional, democratic, safe, and benevolent policy, "old as the Government itself, and founded upon the doctrine of strict construction."

Let us test them.

Congress was empowered by the Constitution to put an end to the slave trade in 1808, and thereby cut off the supply of foreign slaves to the Southern market, and it did exercise this power the moment it had the right to do so.

The was intervention. Was it constitutional, democratic, safe, and benevolent?

The Senator Douglass—*Squatter Sovereignty—* The *Senton Post*, in commenting upon this gentleman's recent speech, takes much pleasure in pointing out, as it asserts, his favorite doctrine of Senator Douglass, and that is, 'THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE OF THE TERRITORIES TO RESOLVE TO EXCLUDE SLAVERY, fully maintained and vindicated.'

This is a work of great power, but the paragraphs italicized we have over read. The pictures of social life skilfully drawn, and with a truth and vividness that stings the soul. Who can read 'Mr. Ben. Doug.' and ever again put the maddening wine-cup to his lips?

The Senate therefore was admonished that there is danger, imminent danger, such only as they are prompt and stern demonstrations all over the North and West can dissipate.

THE POLICY OF NON-INTERVENTION IN RELATION TO THE QUESTION.

The advocates of the policy of Non-Intervention in relation to the Federal Government in relation to slavery, say that it is the only constitutional, democratic, safe, and benevolent policy, "old as the Government itself, and founded upon the doctrine of strict construction."

Congress was empowered by the Constitution to put an end to the slave trade in 1808, and thereby cut off the supply of foreign slaves to the Southern market, and it did exercise this power the moment it had the right to do so.

The was intervention. Was it constitutional, democratic, safe, and benevolent?

A clause was inserted in the Constitution stipulating that a person held to service or labor in one State, escaping into another, should be delivered up to his master, should be delivered up to his master. So, too, by its very terms a clause of compact, containing and implying a grant of power to Congress to provide for its execution, but to be fulfilled by the States, we hold, that its intent and effect were, not to impose any duty of intervention on the part of the Federal Government.

Mr. Douglass, in his speech, asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to give the Federal Government a power to interfere with the slaves in the Territories, and to do it in a manner which would be consistent with the principles of the Constitution.

He asserted that the intent and effect of this provision was to

